NON-PUBLIC
FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

PEER REVIEWER'S REQUEST

DATE: December 22, 2005

TO: John Wong, Chief Engineer, Media Bureau

FROM: Richard Engelman, Chief Engineer, International Bureau

SUBJECT: Influential Scientific Information Peer Review -- *Development of Possible HDFS/FSS Gateway Earth Station Sharing Criteria*

In accordance with the Office of Management and Budget's *Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review* (OMB Bulletin),[1] the International Bureau (IB) seeks peer review for the staff report titled *Development of Possible HDFS/FSS Gateway Earth Station Sharing Criteria* (Staff Report). This Staff Report contains "influential scientific information," as defined in the OMB Bulletin, that will be used to inform a discussion on the development of possible mechanisms to increase the potential for sharing between terrestrial and satellite services in the 37.5-42.5 GHz band in a possible Commission Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

The International Bureau has reviewed the OMB Bulletin and has determined that letter peer review of the Staff Report is appropriate. In addition, the peer review report may be submitted by a qualified FCC engineer or by a panel of qualified FCC engineers. The reviewing engineer(s) should not have been involved in the preparation of the Staff Report.

Attached for your convenience are:

1. A copy of the draft Staff Report
2. Background Memo

Timing and Process

Please forward the completed Reviewer's Report to my attention no later than February 1, 2006. The report will be reviewed by IB and the comments incorporated into the Staff Report as appropriate. You should be aware that the report will also be placed in the record of any proceeding that may rely on the Staff Report and on the FCC's Peer Review web page.

---

[1] 70 Fed. Reg. 2664 (Jan 14, 2005).

Qualifications and Independence

The report should contain a brief statement of the reviewer's job title and qualifications in the field of radio engineering. If the report is completed by a panel, the report should contain a brief statement of the job titles and qualifications in the field of radio engineering for each person on the panel. The report should also contain a statement confirming that the reviewer (or reviewers) did not participate in the creation of the report under review, do not have any financial or other interest in the finding under review, and are in compliance with the federal ethics requirements contained in 18 U.S.C. § 208, 47 U.S.C. § 154 (b) and 5 C.F.R. Part 2635. If upon further review any of the qualifications presents an issue, please contact Richard Engelman as soon as possible. You should also disclose anything that could potentially be viewed as a conflict of interest under the federal government ethics standards.

Scope of Review

IB seeks peer review of the assumptions, calculations, and methodology in the Staff Report, and conclusions drawn from the analysis, to verify that the assumptions, calculations, methodology, and conclusions conform to generally accepted standards in the radio engineering field. We also seek comment on any revisions or improvements that might be necessary to ensure the Staff Report conforms to generally accepted standards in the field. In particular, IB seeks to ensure the accuracy and potential for replication of the study, that scientific uncertainties are clearly identified and characterized, and that the potential implications of the uncertainties for the technical conclusions drawn are clear.

Specific Charges and Responses:

IB seeks responses to the following questions with specific suggestions for improvement, if necessary:

1. Do the assumptions contained in the Staff Report conform to generally accepted standards in the radio engineering field?
2. Do the calculations in the Staff Report conform to generally accepted standards in the radio engineering field?
    a. Are the results accurate?
    b. If statistical methods are used, are the techniques appropriate for the problem?
    c. If software is used, is the software appropriate for the problem and current?
3. Does the methodology contained in the Staff Report conform to generally accepted standards in the radio engineering field?
4. Do the conclusions contained in the Staff Report conform to generally accepted standards in the radio engineering field?
5. Are there any revisions, improvements, or extensions the reviewer recommends to ensure that the Staff Report conforms to generally accepted standards in the radio engineering field?